UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,567	03/27/2006	Satoshi Hashimoto	20060370A	4782
	7590 03/02/200 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			CHRISS, JENNIFER A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
_			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/573,567	HASHIMOTO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LXUIIIICI	AILOIIIL	

	JENNIFER A. CHRISS	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered and amendment (a). They raise new issues that would require further core (b). They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c). They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or. (d). They present additional claims without canceling a considered and the	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	See Continuation Sheet. owable if submitted in a separate, t ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	t before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will <u>not</u>	be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a second content of the co	·		-
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See continuation sheet.	,	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/J. A. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 1794	/Ula C Ruddock/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1794	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection of claims 1 - 5 and 10 - 11 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, the rejection of claims 1 - 2, 4 - 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), 102(b) and 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Endo (US 4,302,556) and the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo (US 4,302,556) in view of Boese (US 3,903,635).

Continuation of 11. In view of Applicant's incorporation of the subject matter of claim 3 into claim 1, the Examiner withdrawn the rejections as listed in section 5 rendering Applicant's arguments moot. In regards to Applicant's amendments concerning Sato et al., Applicant argues that Sato's Comparative Example 6 as relied upon by the Examiner teaches a winding propensity of 0.78 and appears to equate the winding propensity parameter to twist index as claimed by Applicant. The Examiner submits that the comparison is not proper as it is not clear that winding propensity is measured in the same way as twist index is measured by Applicant. For instance, according to paragraph [0044] of Sato et al, the filament is wound around a spool and was allowed to stand at room temperature for 7 days while Applicant's method for measuring twist index involves winding a filament around a spool of the same diameter but it is left standing on the spool for 7 days in an oven warmed at 40 degrees C and then it is brought to room temperature. It should be noted that the process for measuring the winding propensity does not involve keeping the spool for 7 days at 40 degrees C but rather at room temperature. Additionally, the process of Sato lacks details of the crosshead speed, tensile load, etc. The Examiner submits that a fair comparison cannot be made using these parameters. The rejections as anticipated and/or obvious over Sato are maintained.